

Serial No. 09/817,457**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 and replaces the original sheet.

JUL 19 2006

Serial No. 09/817,457

REMARKS

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the helpful comments on the application and for the indication of the allowable subject matter.

The drawings are revised to provide proper labels for elements 1, 2 and 3, as requested in the first paragraph of the Office Action.

In response to the second paragraph of the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the designation for "central station" is not required because any base station can be a central station or controller in accordance with the instant specification. Please see page, 3, lines 30-31. Therefore, it would be improper and contrary to the specification to indicate a particular station as a central station or controller. Applicant therefore declines to mark any element as such and requests withdrawal of the objection.

In response to the third paragraph of the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as were presented and currently stand, are not directed to the method of sorting, but an apparatus. Applicant is not aware of the requirement where an apparatus claim must be supported by a drawing "to show the method of ..." as indicated in the Office Action. If the examiner maintains the objection, he is respectfully requested to provide a case law, a statute from 35 USC or a federal rule from 37 CFR as the authority on which he bases such an objection. In the absence of such showing of binding authority, withdrawal of the objection is warranted.

In response to the objections to the specification, Applicant submits that the appropriate corrections are made, as pointed out in the Office Action. Withdrawal of the objection is thus requested.

Serial No. 09/817,457

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 USC 112. To conclude the prosecution of the application, Applicant's claims are amended as above without conceding any statements or waiving any arguments in the Office Action. It is believed that Applicant's claims now fully comply with 35 USC 112, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over US Publication No. US2003/0014330 (Showgi). In response, claim 5 is canceled by this amendment, thereby obviating the rejection.


Since no art references were asserted in the Office Action against claims 1-4 and dependent claims were rejected merely by virtue of their dependency, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

July 19, 2006

By 
Larry Libérchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior IP Counsel
Philips Electronics N.A. Corporation
914-333-9602